UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,231	06/02/2006	Zhangzhen Jiang	CU-4813 WWP	1368

26530 7590 12/30/2008

LADAS & PARRY LLP
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER	
VU, HOANG-CHUONG Q	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2419	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
12/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/581,231	JIANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HOANG-CHUONG Q. VU	2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 September 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,5-7,9 and 10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,5-7,9 and 10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 June 2006* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

In the Amendment filed on September 12, 2008, claims 2-4, 8, and 11-18 are canceled; thus claims 1, 5-7, 9-10 are pending and have been examined on the merit. The Amendment has been fully considered.

Drawings

1. Figures 1-2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

    1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. **Claims 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sethuram et al. (6,765,928) in view of Wakai et al. (2004/0208554).

Regarding claim 1, Sethuram et al. disclose a synchronous digital hierarchy tributary module supporting multiple service processing, including a Synchronous Digital Hierarchy (SDH) tributary processing unit **(see Fig. 8; SONET/SDH engine (col. 5 lines 49-55))** and service processing units; wherein there are at least two service processing units **(see Fig. 6E; services receive and transmit byte engines for services of various data types (col. 5 lines 41-43))** connected with the SDH tributary processing unit respectively, for mapping and unmapping corresponding service signals **(see col. 7 lines 12-40 and Fig. 8; various type of services are mapped into SHD SPE for transmission and SDH SPE can be demapped to the native data format type for according service)**; the SDH tributary processing unit is for multiplexing and demultiplexing multiple service signals in an SDH signal **(see col. 5 lines 51-55 and col. 17 lines 28-35; the SDH transmit byte engine multiplexes service data received from multiple services for transmission into the SDH communication system as a SONET/SDH frame. See col. 11 lines 44-50 for demultiplexing)**; and wherein the SDH tributary processing unit separates out the service signals corresponding to different service processing units according to different time slots corresponding to the SDH signals of different services **(see col. 6 lines 52-58; segregate information within the SDH data stream for each service which each**

service is transmitted at appropriate time slots within the SDH data stream). However, Sethuram et al. may not explicitly teach wherein the SDH tributary processing unit and the at least two service processing units are disposed on one board; the tributary module further includes a multiple service cross processing unit which is used to implement interconnection among different services, each service processing unit being connected to a local interface through the multiple service cross processing unit. Wakai et al. from the same or similar field of endeavor teach wherein the SDH tributary processing unit and the at least two service processing units are disposed on one board **(see Fig. 7; plurality of processing units 233 and multiplexer/demultiplexer 232/231 are disposed on one interface 230)**; the tributary module further includes a multiple service cross processing unit **(Fig. 7; switch 235)** which is used to implement interconnection among different services, each service processing unit being connected to a local interface through the multiple service cross processing unit **(Fig. 7; each processing unit 233 is connected to packet line interfaces 234 thru the switch 235)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the teaching of Wakai et al. in the teaching of Sethuram et al. to provide an interface/board for integrating a plurality of processing units and a mux/demux module in a single platform. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have motivated to do so to improve space as multiple components can be built into a single board. One of ordinary skill in the art would also have motivated to include the switch as taught by Wakai et al. to cross-connect low speed lines with each processing unit to switch a particular service to the correct

processing unit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to do so to appropriately transmit data to destined unit for processing.

5. **Claims 5 and 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sethuram et al. (6,765,928) in view of Wakai et al. (2004/0208554), and further in view of Shimbashi et al. (6,798,779).

Regarding claim 5, Sethuram et al. further teach the synchronous digital hierarchy tributary module supporting multiple service processing, wherein a SDH equipment node time-division multiplexes multiple service SDH signals into one SDH signal **(see col. 4 lines 58-67 and col. 5 lines 52-55 and col. 6 lines 54-55; multiplexing service data from multiple services into SONET/SDH frames/streams using appropriate time slots)**. However, Sethuram et al. and Wakai et al. may not explicitly teach a cross module for performing multiplexing step. Shimbashi et al. from the same or similar field of endeavor teach a crossconnect or switching circuit to perform arrangements of VT signals and ATM to appropriate time slot **(see Fig. 8)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a crossconnect to multiplex multiple data services into a SDH stream. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time would have motivated to do so to convert multiple services into a SDH stream for faster transmission.

Regarding claim 6, Sethuram et al. further teach a synchronous digital hierarchy communication supporting multiple service processing, wherein the services to be sent from the local to the SDH side are mapped by the service processing units respectively **(see col. 17 line 65 thru col. 18 line 16 and Fig. 8; Each type of services are**

mapped into STS frames for transmission) and sent to the SDH tributary processing unit for multiplexing **(see col. 5 lines 51-55; the SDH transmit byte engine multiplexes service data received from multiple services for transmission into the SDH communication system as a SONET/SDH frame. Also see col. 17 lines 28-35)**, different services being multiplexed in different time slots **(see col. 6 lines 52-58)**. Shimbashi et al. further teach the cross module of the SDH equipment node transmits the signals of different time slots to corresponding line modules or other tributary modules **(see Fig. 8; VT signals are arranged to time slots by crossconnect or switching. See Fig. 15, signals are transmitted to interface modules IF)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the teaching of Shimbashi et al. in the teaching of Sethuram et al. and Wakai et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to utilize the crossconnect taught by Shimbashi et al. to transmit signals of different time slots to output the signals. The motivation for doing so is to provide efficient time for transmitting SDH stream of different data services.

6. **Claims 7, 9, and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sethuram et al. (6,765,928) in view of Shimbashi et al. (6,798,779) and Wakai et al. (2004/0208554).

Regarding claim 7, Sethuram et al. disclose a SDH equipment node using the synchronous digital hierarchy tributary module, including a plurality of local interfaces **(see col. 16 line 66 thru col. 17 line 2; services engine interfaces and processes M streams of variable data types)**, wherein the SDH tributary module comprises an SDH

tributary processing unit **(see Fig. 8; SONET/SDH engine (col. 5 lines 49-55))** and at least two service processing units **(see Fig. 6E; services receive and transmit byte engines for services of various data types (col. 5 lines 41-43))** connected with the SDH tributary processing unit respectively , the service processing unit being for mapping and unmapping corresponding service signal **(see col. 7 lines 12-40 and Fig. 8; various type of services are mapped into SHD SPE for transmission and SDH SPE can be demapped to the native data format type for according service)**, and the SDH tributary processing unit being for multiplexing and demultiplexing multiple service signals in an SDH signal **(see col. 5 lines 51-55 and col. 17 lines 28-35; the SDH transmit byte engine multiplexes service data received from multiple services for transmission into the SDH communication system as a SONET/SDH frame. See col. 11 lines 44-50 for demultiplexing)**; and wherein the SDH tributary processing unit separates out the service signals corresponding to different service processing units according to different time slots corresponding to the SDH signals of different service **(see col. 6 lines 52-58; segregate information within the SDH data stream for each service which each service is transmitted at appropriate time slots within the SDH data stream)**. But, Sethuram et al. may not explicitly teach a plurality of line modules, a cross module connected with the line modules respectively and a plurality of SDH tributary modules connected with the cross module respectively. However, Shimbashi et al. from the same or similar field of endeavor teach a plurality of line modules **(see Fig. 15, interface modules IF 152-1 thru 152-m)**, a cross module connected with the line modules respectively **(see Fig. 15, IF modules connected to**

crossconnecting units) and a plurality of SDH tributary modules connected with the cross module respectively **(see Fig. 15, STS mux and dmux)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the system of Shimbashi et al. in the system taught by Sethuram et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to cross module, IF modules taught by Shimbashi et al. to perform STS crossconnect operation. The motivation for doing so is to accommodate various type of services and to handle various data information in an STM format **(see Shimbashi et al. col. 1 lines 14-45).** However, Sethuram et al. and Shimbashi et al. may not explicitly teach wherein the SDH tributary processing unit and the at least two service processing units are disposed on one board the tributary module further includes a multiple service cross processing unit which is used to implement interconnection among different services, each service processing unit being connected to a local interface through the multiple service cross processing unit. Wakai et al. from the same or similar field of endeavor teach wherein the SDH tributary processing unit and the at least two service processing units are disposed on one board **(see Fig. 7; plurality of processing units 233 and multiplexer/demultiplexer 232/231 are disposed on one interface 230)**; the tributary module further includes a multiple service cross processing unit **(Fig. 7; switch 235)** which is used to implement interconnection among different services, each service processing unit being connected to a local interface through the multiple service cross processing unit **(Fig. 7; each processing unit 233 is connected to packet line interfaces 234 thru the switch 235)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to employ the teaching of Wakai et al. in the teaching of Sethuram et al. and Shimbashi et al. to provide an interface/board for integrating a plurality of processing units and a mux/demux module in a single platform. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have motivated to do so to improve space as multiple components can be built into a single board. One of ordinary skill in the art would also have motivated to include the switch as taught by Wakai et al. to cross-connect low speed lines with each processing unit to switch a particular service to the correct processing unit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to do so to appropriately transmit data to destined unit for processing.

Regarding claim 9, Sethuram et al. further teach the synchronous digital hierarchy tributary module supporting multiple service processing, wherein a SDH equipment node time-division multiplexes multiple service SDH signals into one SDH signal **(see col. 4 lines 58-67 and col. 5 lines 52-55 and col. 6 lines 54-55; multiplexing service data from multiple services into SONET/SDH frames/streams using appropriate time slots)**. Shimbashi et al. further teach a crossconnect or switching circuit to perform arrangements of VT signals and ATM to appropriate time slot **(see Fig. 8)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a crossconnect of Shimbashi et al. to multiplex multiple data services into a SDH stream. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time would have motivated to do so to convert multiple services into a SDH stream for faster transmission.

Regarding claim 10, Sethuram et al. further teach a synchronous digital hierarchy communication supporting multiple service processing, wherein the services to be sent from the local to the SDH side are mapped by the service processing units respectively **(see col. 17 line 65 thru col. 18 line 16 and Fig. 8; Each type of services are mapped into STS frames for transmission)** and sent to the SDH tributary processing unit for multiplexing **(see col. 5 lines 51-55; the SDH transmit byte engine multiplexes service data received from multiple services for transmission into the SDH communication system as a SONET/SDH frame. Also see col. 17 lines 28-35)**, different services being multiplexed in different time slots **(see col. 6 lines 52-58)**. Shimbashi et al. further teach the cross module of the SDH equipment node transmits the signals of different time slots to corresponding line modules or other tributary modules **(see Fig. 8; VT signals are arranged to time slots by crossconnect or switching. See Fig. 15, signals are transmitted to interface modules IF)**. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the teaching of Shimbashi et al. in the teaching of Sethuram et al. and Wakai et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to utilize the crossconnect taught by Shimbashi et al. to transmit signals of different time slots to output the signals. The motivation for doing so is to provide efficient time for transmitting SDH stream of different data services.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed September 12, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. On page 7 of the Applicant's Response regarding Sethuram et al. reference, Applicant argues that Sethuram et al do not disclose or suggest demultiplexing the service signals corresponding to different service processing units according to different time slots. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees since Sethuram et al. disclose segregating information within the SDH data stream for each service which each service is transmitted at appropriate time slots within the SDH data stream **(see col. 6 lines 52-58)** and services byte engines demultiplex SONET/SDH fames/streams into service data for transmission to the multiple services **(see col. 5 lines 58-62)**.

9. On page 10 of the Applicant's Response, Applicant amends claim 1 to include "wherein the SDH tributary processing unit and the at least two service processing units are disposed on one board"; this limitation has been addressed in the rejection above.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HOANG-CHUONG Q. VU whose telephone number is (571) 270-3945. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST. and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EDAN ORGAD can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. V./ 12/15/08
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419